

REMARKS

In the subject Office Action, the examiner objected to the specification and Claim 9, rejected Claim 6 for indefiniteness under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and rejected Claims 1-7 and 10 under 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a). Claims 8-9 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of base Claim 1 and any intervening claims. Applicant requests reconsideration of his application in view of this response, which cancels Claim 6, Claim 10 and allowable Claim 8, and amends Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9.

Rejected Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable Claim 8 (now canceled), thereby rendering Claim 1 allowable, along with dependent Claims 2-5, 7 and 9. Allowable Claim 9 was amended to depend from Claim 1 instead of Claim 7. Claims 5 and 7 were amended for consistency with amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 1-5, 7 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Navarre, Attorney
Registration No. 29572
Telephone: (937) 653-3501